LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor: R. Palme Dutt

50 YEARS OF WORLD REVOLUTION
The Editor

HANDS OFF THE UNIONS!
Len Squire, Ken Gill, Ben Birnbaum

WILSON'S BONN VISIT
Quaestor

KHARTOUM CONFERENCE
Dr. Yusuf Dadoo

Peace in the Middle East, Tawfiq Toubi
Immigrants & the Vote, Enid Lakeman
Haldane TV Profile, Ivor Montagu

MARCH 1969

3s. 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

Editor: R. Palme Dutt Associate Editor: R. Page Arnot
Managing Editor: Nicola Seyd

VOL. 51 No. 3 MARCH . 1969

CONTENTS

Page

Notes of the Month: Fifty Years of the World Revolution. *Illusion of Disillusion—The World Revolution: A Historical Epoch—Creative Contribution of the Communist International—First Revolutionary Wave—Initial Conception of the International General Staff—Transition to the Role of World Guide, Teacher and Organiser—Tactical Shortcomings—Leadership in the Fight Against Fascism and the Fascist War Offensive—Communists in the Second World War—Extending the Range of the World Revolution—Co-operation Against Imperialism—'It Moves'* **R.P.D.** 97

Hands Off the Unions! Trade Union leaders on the fight against the White Paper .. **Len Squire, Ben Birnbaum, Ken Gill** 113

Forty Years Ago. Crisis in the mining industry 118

Eduardo Mondlane. Tribute to outstanding leader of the Mozambique Liberation Front .. .. .. **M. P. Naicker** 119

International Women's Day. Origin of March 8th; struggles of the past and present in pictures 120, 121

Wilson's Bonn Visit. The dangerous trends of Anglo-West German military links .. .. **Quaestor** 122

Khartoum Conference—A Landmark. International support for the struggle against white supremacy regimes **Dr. Yusuf Dadoo** 126

Conference Document on Mobilisation 130

Immigrants and the Vote. Director of the Electoral Reform Society on representation of minorities under alternative voting systems .. .. **Enid Lakeman** 131

New Managing Editor 134

Middle East: The Path to Peace. Urgent need to implement UN resolution .. .. **Tawfiq Toubi** 135

Filleted Haldane. BBC Television profile of J.B.S. **Ivor Montagu** 140

Rich Seam. Review of musical play, 'Close the Coalhouse Door' **Roger Woddis** 141

Book Reviews: 'The Complete Bolivian Diaries of Che Guevara' edited by Daniel James: *William J. Pomeroy;* 'Your Parliament', Charles D. Bateman: *Ruth Longoni;* 'Children of Vietnam', H. C. Carlisle, and '"Limited Bombing" in Vietnam', Peter and Gunilla Weiss: *Hilda Vernon;* 'Vicious Circle', Wilfred Wood and John Downing: *D. N. Pritt* 142

A Matter of Priority 144

Publications Received .. .. Inside back cover

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

FIFTY YEARS OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION

'Communism has travelled a hard road: of ascent followed by periods of sharp decline; successes, but also severe defeats. In spite of all, the development in essence has gone the way forecast by the Manifesto of the Communist Party. The epoch of the last decisive battle came later than the apostles of the social revolution expected and wished. But it has come. . . .
Socialist criticism has sufficiently stigmatised the bourgeois world order. The task of the International Communist Party is now to overthrow this order and to erect in its place the structure of the socialist world order.'

Manifesto of the Foundation Congress of the Communist International, March, 1919

February 17, 1969

Fifty years ago this month the Communist International was born. In stirring words the Manifesto of the First Congress (drafted incidentally by Trotsky, that master of the spoken and written word, though not of political judgement, and signed by Lenin and the other leaders of delegations of parties and groups participating in the Congress), which came to be known as the New Communist Manifesto triumphantly following up the original Manifesto of the Communist Party of Marx and Engels seven decades earlier, proclaimed the character of the world epoch which had opened in fulfilment of the predictions of the original Communist Manifesto:

> The new era has begun! The era of the downfall of capitalism—its internal disintegration. The epoch of the proletarian communist revolution. In some countries, victorious proletarian revolution; increasing revolutionary ferment in other lands; uprisings in the colonies; utter incapacity of the ruling classes to control the fate of peoples any longer—that is the picture of world conditions today.

Today half a century has passed since that proclamation of the new epoch which had opened. What is the outcome of this experience of half a century? What of the position of world capitalism? What of the position of world communism and socialism? How much has been achieved? How much remains to be achieved? What new problems clamour for solution?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Illusion of Disillusion

These questions are no idle historical questions of a commemoration. They are urgent present questions. For the very success of the advance of the world socialist revolution during this half century: the advance of socialism from a single state over one sixth of the world to fourteen states over one third of the world; the advance of national liberation and downfall of the old empires; the change of the world balance and weakening of imperialism: all this has compelled the rulers of the dying old order to change their tune nowadays, and to seek by every means at their command to conceal and disguise this success from the understanding of the younger generation who have not lived through it. Therefore they seek to proclaim through a thousand trumpets of their megaphone press, radio and television that it has all been an illusion and a colossal failure, ending in a bitter harvest of universal disillusion. Fleet Street and the snug studios of television swarm nowadays with self-announced 'ex-revolutionaries' who preach, at highly lucrative rates, the modern gospel of disillusion. With gloomy gusto they explain how in their youthful days they were misled by visions of a utopia on earth, or worshipped the false idol of the Soviet Union, until now their knowledge of the hideous reality has left them no consolation save to retreat into the fleshpots of Mammon, in order from this vantage point to warn the present-day young never to be trapped by those illusions of which they had been the victims in the thirties or the twenties or whenever. Quite a flourishing profession nowadays, the 'ex-revolutionaries' in the modern capitalist world.

New Tunes for Old Hymns of Hate

Previously the rulers and prophets of the then self-assured capitalist world used to refer with a contemptuous sneer to the Soviet aim of building socialism in war-ravaged Russia as an 'experiment' of fanatical amateurs ignorant of the laws of economics, and bound to end in hopeless economic chaos and collapse. Now they describe the Soviet Union as a 'super-power' whose might is a menace to the world. Previously they used to describe the Marxist theory of world revolution as an empty 'pipe-dream' which could never be realised. Now they are busy building military alliances in every region of the world, on the basis of whatever reactionary rulers and satellite states they can knock together with the aid of financial subsidies and arms supplies, to stem the advance of the peoples everywhere advancing to end national and class oppression. Previously they used to dismiss the teachings of Lenin as a doctrinaire attempt to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

apply the obsolete and long exploded nineteenth century theories of Marx to the modern twentieth century world. Now they pooh-pooh Marxism-Leninism as an obsolete doctrine based on the vanished conditions of the early twentieth century, and eagerly try to resurrect instead as the latest most modern up-to-date idea an imaginary 'Marxism', provided it is kept clear of all connection with Lenin or the world revolution or the organised communist movement. Indeed—for they are aware that the majority of young people today are critical of their social order and seeking for an alternative—they are ready to provide the most lavish high-powered publicity for any and every 'left' theory, even the most fantastic really obsolete anarchist confusions long ago fought off the battle-field by Marxism, so long as it is anti-communist and critical of the Soviet Union.

The World Revolution—A Historical Epoch

All the bogus 'historians' and 'experts' of the capitalist world, who nowadays in ever increasing numbers specialise in the dissection of Marxism and in 'Kremlinology', love to expose the alleged fond illusions of Lenin and the Bolsheviks who are supposed to have expected that the victory of the October revolution in 1917 would be immediately followed by the extension of the socialist revolution to the other leading capitalist countries within the next few years. Equally the pundits who make this assertion are only revealing their ignorance of the facts and of the teachings of Marx and Lenin. Ignorance of the facts: for it was precisely Lenin who chastised most mercilessly leftist assumptions of the speedy victory of the world revolution and described such assumptions as 'a blind gamble':

> Yes, we will see the international world revolution; but for the time being it is a very good fairy tale—I quite understand children liking beautiful fairy tales. But I ask, is it becoming for a serious revolutionary to believe fairy tales?
>
> (Lenin, *Report on War and Peace to the Seventh Congress of the Russian Communist Party*, March 7, 1918)

Similarly in his letter to the American workers on August 20, 1918, Lenin wrote:

> We place our stakes on the inevitability of the international revolution; but that does not mean that we are fools enough to place our stakes on the revolution coming on some *definite* and early date.

Thus on the elementary facts the pundits proclaim the exact opposite of the truth. But even more important is their complete ignorance of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the basic teachings of Marx and Lenin on this very question. For it was the consistent teaching of Marx and Lenin that the world socialist revolution could be no sudden dramatic coup transforming the world from capitalism to socialism in the twinkling of an eye, but that on the contrary the painful path of the transition from capitalism to socialism (itself the necessary precursor of the subsequent advance to communism) would constitute a prolonged historical epoch. This is the epoch in which we live.

Prolonged Path to Revolution

Marx as long ago as 1851 wrote that the workers must be prepared to go through 'fifty years of civil wars and international wars' before they would reach the fitness to win and exercise political power:

> We say to the workers: 'You will have to go through fifteen, twenty, fifty years of civil wars and international wars, not only in order to change existing conditions, but also in order to change yourselves and fit yourselves for the exercise of political power.'
>
> (Marx, *Revelations on the Communist Trial at Cologne*, 1851)

In contrast to the impatience of anarchism Marx and Engels taught that in the conditions of dominant capitalism the advance of the working class to ripeness for revolution is necessarily slow. Lenin emphasised the appropriateness of this teaching for the period of the Second International:

> *In those days,* after the defeat of the Paris Commune, history made slow organisational and educational work the task of the day. Nothing else was possible. The anarchists were then (as they are now) fundamentally wrong, not only theoretically, but also economically and politically. The anarchists misjudged the character of the times, for they failed to understand the world situation.
>
> Marx and Engels gauged the times accurately; they understood the international situation; they understood that the approach to the beginning of the social revolution must be *slow.*
>
> (Lenin, *The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution*, April, 1917)

The fault of the Second International did not lie in this peaceful educational role, but in the fact that, when history moved into the new era of the general crisis of capitalism, of wars and revolutions, with the war of 1914, its leadership abandoned all their pledges and basis of international socialism, and joined instead with their rival imperialist masters to hound on the workers to mutual slaughter. Therefore it became necessary to rally and unite all the living forces of the international socialist movement in the new International or

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Third International, which replaced the bankruptcy of the Second and drew inspiration from the First, and which was, as Engels had anticipated, 'directly Communist':

> I believe that the next International, after Marx's writings have exercised their influence for some years, will be directly Communist, and will proclaim precisely our principles.
>
> (Engels, *letter to Sorge*, September 12-17, 1874)

As so often with the predictions of Marxism, the principle was correct, and has been proved by the practical outcome, but took longer than anticipated. It was not 'the next International', but the Third which fulfilled Engels's anticipation of the Communist International.

Complex Process of Revolution

After the victory of the October revolution Lenin repeatedly insisted, against the over-sanguine anticipation of those who expected the speedy victory of the socialist revolution in Western Europe, or who even, like Trotsky, regarded the survival of the Soviet state as dependent on the victory of the working class and socialist revolution in Western Europe, that in the advanced capitalist countries of Western Europe it would be far more difficult for the working class to begin the revolution and win political power than in Russia, but once political power had been won, far easier to carry through the tasks of reconstruction:

> A backward country can get off to an easy start, because the opponent is rotten and the bourgeoisie unorganised. But to continue, it will have to be a hundred thousand times more prudent, careful and persistent.
>
> In Western Europe it will be different, there it will be incalculably harder to begin, but incalculably easier to continue.

Therefore the world socialist revolution began, not in the most advanced capitalist countries, as originally anticipated by Marx in his earlier writings, but at the weakest link among the imperialist powers, in Russia where at the same time the working class on the basis of Marxism had reached the highest level of political consciousness and revolutionary organisation. From there the advance extended, not at once to the capitalist countries in the West, but again first to the further weakest points in the imperialist world network, through the upsurge of the revolt of the peoples in the colonial countries, inspired to new heights by the victory of the October revolution and the stirring example of the fulfilment of liberation of the Asiatic peoples previously subject to Tsarism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Creative Contribution of the Communist International

This was the conception which Lenin outlined in his famous last article (*Better Fewer, But Better*, in March, 1923), when, in answer to the question of the future prospect of socialism, he pointed out that 'in the last analysis the upshot of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, China, etc., account for the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe', and since the mass of the colonial peoples oppressed by imperialism was now 'definitely drawn into the general maelstrom of the world revolutionary movement' opened by 1917, thus also undermining the basis of the entanglement with imperialism which had delayed the advance of the Western working class, this gathering of the world majority on the side of the revolution meant that 'in this respect there cannot be the slightest shadow of doubt what the final outcome of the world struggle will be', and 'in this sense the complete victory of socialism is fully and absolutely assured'. This unique and concrete analysis of the path and stages of advance of the world socialist revolution (foreshadowed in a preliminary form by Marx in his writings on India and China, and his recognition during his later years of Russia as having become the 'vanguard' of the revolution), leaving far behind the narrow European horizons of the theorists of the Second International, was one of the signal contributions of Lenin's creative development of Marxism in the conditions of the modern epoch. Similarly the active and tireless championship of the theory and practice of the alliance of the working class in the imperialist countries and the national liberation movement in the countries oppressed by imperialism was an outstanding and imperishable constructive achievement of the Communist International, reaching out to ground never touched by the Second International. Lenin showed how it was precisely through this variety of forms and phases that 'the transition from capitalism to socialism occupies an entire historical epoch':

> The socialist revolution cannot take place in any other form than that of an epoch, uniting the civil war of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in the leading countries with a whole series of democratic, revolutionary and national emancipatory movements in the undeveloped backward and oppressed countries. Why is this? Because capitalism develops unequally.
>
> (Lenin, *On a Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism*, 1916)

The events of the past fifty years have abundantly confirmed this prediction of the character of the modern epoch.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

First World Revolutionary Wave

March, 1919, the date of the founding of the Communist International, was a high point of the first world revolutionary wave which followed 1917. In that month the working class in Hungary set up their Hungarian Soviet Republic, the pioneer forerunner of the future extension of the socialist revolution beyond the borders of the Soviet Republic, which was only to receive its subsequent fulfilment after the vanquishing of fascism at the end of the second world war. The Hungarian Soviet Republic held power for over three months, until it was overthrown by the invasion of the Czechoslovak armies of Masaryk and the Romanian armies acting jointly under the orders of French imperialism to crush the socialist revolution, thereby clearing the way for fascism to hold Hungary in its grip for a quarter of a century. Immediately after there was established the Bavarian Soviet Republic in the heart of Central Europe, which was destroyed by the forces of German militarism under the auspices of right-wing Social-Democracy. All over Germany there were clashes approaching civil war. In April the revolt of the sailors of the French Navy in the Black Sea expressed the solidarity of the Western workers with the Soviet Republic; and unrest spread among the British soldiers dispatched to Archangel. In Britain the soldiers' strikes compelled speedy demobilisation; the strike movement reached to great heights alongside the Hands off Russia campaign, which presaged the Councils of Action in the following year. Mass struggles at every level dominated the world scene from Cairo to Tokyo, from Winnipeg to Dublin. Premier Lloyd George presented a memorandum to the Paris Peace Conference on March 25 declaring: 'The whole of Europe is in a revolutionary mood.'

Initial Conception of the International General Staff

It was in these conditions of the world-wide struggle of revolution and counter-revolution that the Communist International was founded. Therefore its original constitution, fully elaborated at its Second Congress in 1920, was initially formed to combine strong centralised international leadership with its democratic basis of equality of parties and election of the Executive. This character of the constitution was not only planned in order to replace the fatal looseness of the old Second International, the laxity of whose parties in carrying out international decisions had led to its being described in derision as the 'post-box International', and which had finally led to its collapse and death. The purpose was also seen as a practical

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

response to the conditions of the then existing phase of the world situation. The centralised international leadership was devised in order to fulfil the indispensable function of an international general staff of the revolution, capable of uniting the struggle against its counterpart, the Paris Supreme Council of the Western powers, which functioned as the centralised leadership of counter-revolution, dispatched Czech and Romanian troops to crush the Socialist revolution in Hungary, financed and armed the White generals in Russia, or organised the wars of intervention of fourteen states against the Soviet Republic.

Transition to the Role of World Guide, Teacher and Organiser

By 1923 the world revolutionary wave had ebbed and gave place to the temporary stabilisation of capitalism which opened with the Dawes Plan in 1924. Therefore the function of the Communist International changed correspondingly to meet the new conditions. Already by December, 1921, the Executive adopted the theses on 'The United Working Class Front', (which were first published in English in the issue of this journal for February, 1922). At the Fourth Congress in November, 1922, Lenin made his last speech to the international movement, and gave the advice that in this period of temporary respite from the phase of war, 'we must take advantage of every moment of respite from fighting, from war, to study, and to study from scratch'; 'the most important thing in the period we are now entering is to study'; and that, while the Russian comrades needed to study to fulfil the most elementary tasks of overcoming illiteracy and backwardness, the literate and 'enlightened' foreign comrades needed to 'study in the special sense, in order that they may really understand the organisation, structure, method and content of revolutionary work.' For those Western comrades who considered themselves too advanced to need to learn from Russia, and who dismissed the organisational conceptions of Bolshevism as appropriate only to Russian conditions, Lenin conceded in a passage of scorching irony that the correct organisational resolution of the Third Congress had proved a dead-letter since it was 'too Russian' to be understood by any foreigner ('In the first place, it is too long, containing fifty or more paragraphs; foreigners are not usually able to read such things'); nevertheless, 'the resolution must be carried out', and the way must be found to help the non-Russian comrades to understand it and 'assimilate part of the Russian experience'. Then with a characteristic penetrating foresight into the whole character of the coming period he suggested that fascism (Mussolini had just

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

come to power only a few weeks before in Italy) might prove the instrument which would teach the Western working class the necessary lesson:

> The fascisti in Italy may render us a great service by showing the Italians that they are not yet sufficiently enlightened and that their country is not yet ensured against the Black Hundreds. Perhaps this will be very useful.

The Communist International performed a historic task in the nineteen-twenties in helping, through joint international experience and contact, to mould and train the very heterogeneous array of revolutionary forces derived from the old social-democratic movement into developing as unified and experienced revolutionary parties on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and organised to conduct effective mass activity. At the same time in the field of action the aim was set towards the united working class front.

Tactical Shortcomings

Nevertheless, in the complex conditions of the next phase of the international situation, when the breakdown of the temporary stabilisation of capitalism developed into the world economic crisis of 1929-32 and the onset of the offensive of fascism, serious tactical shortcomings were revealed in the response of the International to the urgent needs of the new situation. The Sixth Congress in 1928 had correctly predicted the approaching breakdown of the temporary stabilisation and its replacement by a world economic crisis opening a new 'third period' in international development; and the Tenth Plenum in July, 1929, elaborated this economic analysis—so much so that, when the crash came in October, 1929, US Senators, recalling these predictions, complained that the International must have had a hand in the world economic crisis. But the tactical conclusions drawn pointed in the wrong direction. Lenin's final warning in his last speech to the international movement on the significances of the offensive of fascism for future development in Europe was overlooked. Instead, the main blow was directed against social-democracy as the principal enemy and twin partner of fascism. This found expression in the slogan 'Class Against Class' and the presentation of the aim of the united front from below as in opposition to the united front from above. Certainly the appalling record of the Social-Democratic governments in suppressing and shooting down the militant workers, opposing every form of united action, establishing emergency regimes, and even in some countries entering into direct treaties of alliance with fascism made under-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

standable the bitterness of this fight, which found extreme expression in the use of the disastrous term 'social fascism', intended only to describe the policy of the top leadership, but inevitably tending in practice to be applied also to the lower officials. Walter Ulbricht, who was Secretary of the Berlin Communist Party organisation at the time has since made clear (in his report on the *Outline History of the German Working Class Movement 1863-1963*) that this term and the line associated with it did not originate from the German Communist Party, but reflected 'Stalin's dogmatic and schematic ideas on the role of social-democracy'. This line hindered the main task to devote every effort to promote a united front with the Social-Democratic Party in order to prevent fascism coming to power. Hitler came to power—a heavy blow for the working class and the peoples of the world.

Leadership in the Fight Against Fascism and the Fascist War Offensive

Once Hitler had come to power the communists everywhere responded to the urgent fight which had now opened, and during those critical years of the thirties were in the forefront of all the efforts to promote the broadest co-operation in the common fight against fascism and against the war offensive of fascism. Dimitrov in the dock defying Goering inspired the peoples of the whole world. By the following year in 1934 practical results were already being achieved with the united working class front holding fascism at bay in France, and agreement between the Communist and Socialist Parties preparing the way for the People's Front. The Seventh Congress in 1935 sounded the clarion call which won response in every country for unity against fascism and war. As the extending fascist aggression which was the prelude of the second world war crept forward, of Japanese fascism to conquer Manchuria, of Italian fascism against Ethiopia, of German and Italian fascism to overthrow Spanish democracy, the communists were in the forefront of the fight. The corrupt and reactionary rulers of Britain and France connived at the extending fascist aggression, financed and rearmed Hitler, and tore up all their previous treaties banning German rearmament, in the hope that they were thus building a powerful military machine to smash the Soviet Union and communism. This policy reached its climax with the Four Power Pact of Chamberlain, Hitler, Mussolini and Daladier at Munich to carve up and hand over Czechoslovakia to Hitler and thereby open his path to the East. But the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact smashed Munich. The British and French Governments, who had refused the alliance

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the Soviet Union which their peoples had demanded, and which could have checked Hitler's aggression and prevented the second world war, had to learn the hard way. Within eleven days of the signing of the Pact the British and French Munichite Governments declared war on Hitler, not for the sake of Danzig (they had connived at much more), nor for the defence of Poland (no finger was stirred for the defence of Poland), but because, as the official booklet *The British Case*, with the preface by the Foreign Secretary, Lord Halifax, explained, Hitler had committed the supreme 'apostasy' of making peace with the Soviet Union.

Communists in the Second World War

Communists fought in the forefront in each successive phase of the extending fascist aggression which ushered in the second world war, notably in the International Brigade, at a time when many also on the left were still supporting what was falsely called 'appeasement'. The hypocritical declaration of a phony war by the British and French Munichite Governments against Germany presented the British and French parties with a special temporary problem. They sought initially to solve it by a twofold strategy of combining the military war against Hitler with the political struggle against their reactionary governments at home. But the events of September soon showed that this line was untenable, since there was no military war against Hitler (Generals Keitel and Jodl subsequently testified at the Nuremburg trial that at the moment when all their main forces were concentrated in Poland, with only five divisions in the West, the generals had warned Hitler that if the Anglo-French command, with overwhelming military superiority, should attack, they would have no alternative save to surrender, whereupon Hitler had assured the generals that they need not worry, since the British and French would not attack). Instead, the Anglo-French military moves were all directed towards action against the Soviet Union, as over Finland, and the ardent anti-fascist feelings of the people were being exploited for very different purposes. Hence it became necessary to expose without mercy this reactionary imperialist strategy. But after the Anglo-French passivity had opened the way to Hitler's extending aggression and conquest in Western Europe in 1940, the communists were in the forefront in organising the resistance movements in country after country. In June, 1940, the French party presented its memorandum to the French Government outlining a plan for the defence of Paris, and declaring that surrender of Paris would be betrayal of France, and in July, 1940, issued the call to the French

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people for the resistance fight for the independence of France. In Britain the fall of the Munichites from the leadership of the Government, and their replacement by Churchill, opened a new stage.

Fulfilment of the Great Alliance

Thus by the time that Hitler, having established his domination over all Western Europe except Britain, launched his attack on the Soviet Union, the conditions had become ripe for the alliance with the Soviet Union, which had before been refused, to be welcomed by the British Government and ruling class, as well as by the entire British people and all the peoples struggling against fascism. The great alliance of the peoples for the defeat of the fascist aggressors had at last been fulfilled. In this war of liberation, drawing in the peoples in all parts of the world, which ended in the destruction of the military power of fascism and in which the Soviet armies and people bore the main burden and delivered the main blows at the enemy, the communists and their parties in all countries played an active part. The parties grew in popularity and numbers to such an extent and over so wide a range that the old forms of international organisation became outgrown. In 1943 the formal organisation of the Communist International, by consultation and agreement of all the main constituent parties, was dissolved. A new era had opened of unparalleled advance of the world revolution and the world communist movement.

Extending Range of the World Revolution

On the eve of the second world war Stalin, in his report to the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in March, 1939, warned the British and French Governments of the 'fiasco' to which their Munichite policy would lead:

> The big and dangerous political game started by the supporters of the policy of non-intervention may end in a serious fiasco for them.

And already at the Seventeenth Congress in 1934 he had given a prediction of the prospective outcome of the planned anti-Soviet war:

> Let not Messieurs the bourgeoisie blame us if some of the governments so near and dear to them, which today rule happily 'by the grace of God', are missing on the morrow after such a war. . . . It can hardly be doubted that a second war against the USSR will lead to the complete defeat of the aggressors, to revolution in a number of countries in Europe and Asia, and to the destruction of the bourgeois-landlord governments in these countries.

This prediction of Marxism-Leninism has been fulfilled in the post-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1945 era with notable accuracy. The military power of the Nazi aggressors was smashed. The fascist bourgeois-landlord regimes in the countries of Eastern Europe gave place to people's democracies, which advanced to the achievement of peaceful socialist revolutions. The Western colonial empires in Asia collapsed, despite all the frantic efforts of British, French, Dutch and American imperialism to rebuild their colonial regime after the departure of the Japanese invaders, with endless military expeditions and prolonged colonial wars to crush the local liberation movements. India won independence after the revolt of the armed forces. The Chinese people won their liberation battle by 1949 against the US-armed and financed forces of Chiang Kai-shek. By the sixties the advance of independence was extending also to smaller territories in Africa, which could never have won it by their own strength alone in face of the colossal coercive might of imperialism, but were now able to win recognition of their independence (even though considerably limited by the methods of neo-colonialism), thanks to the weakening of imperialism and increased strength of the socialist sector of the world. There are still heavy liberation battles to be fought and won: in South East Asia, in the Middle East and in Southern Africa (not to mention the horrors let loose by British imperialist policy on Biafra), as well as against the whole strategy of neo-colonialism.

Problems of Growth

The world communist movement has leaped forward in the number of parties and membership during this era. The ten parties of 1918 have become some ninety today. The membership of 1,680,000 in 1928, which had risen to 4,202,000 by 1939, reached 44,700,000 by 1964. If from this total we separate those in the socialist countries, aggregate communist membership in the non-socialist countries has risen from 443,000 in 1928 to 1,750,000 by 1939 and 5,600,000 by 1964. In face of this advance the enemies of communism try to console themselves today by pointing to the divisions which exist in the communist world. A host of new socialist states has come into existence, with various previous backgrounds and national histories. Tens of millions have come into the communist movement, from various social and political and non-political backgrounds. It would be idle to imagine that all the problems arising in the new situation can be solved automatically at once, or do not give rise to strains. In the case of China it is evident that the inheritance of the peasant and national background

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Chinese revolution prior to the victory of liberation under the leadership of the Communist Party has still left its impact on the present phase. In Europe the new situation of the parallel existence of a series of socialist states, in place of the single socialist state, has given rise to new problems of combining the principle of national sovereignty with the defence of common interests against imperialism or for mutual economic existence. These problems have grown out of the current historical stage. There can be every confidence that, whatever the difficult phases which may still have to be passed through, these temporary difficulties can and will be eventually overcome on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, with further experience in the struggle and common endeavours to reach a path of solution.

Internationalism Lives

To help overcome these differences and promote the unity of the world communist movement is necessarily the urgent concern of every communist. The ending of the particular form of organisation of the Communist International a quarter of a century ago, as no longer appropriate to new conditions, did not mean the ending of the principle of internationalism. When Marx and Engels dissolved the First International (initially in the form of transferring its headquarters to the United States), it was to prevent the formal organisation being rent by anarchist factionalism and to ensure that the true principle of working class internationalism should be carried forward, without depending on the existence of a specific form of organisation. The resolution on the dissolution of the Communist International in 1943 declared:

> Communists have never been supporters of the conservation of organisational forms that have outlived themselves. They have always subordinated forms of organisation of the working class movement and the methods of working of such organisations to the fundamental political interest of the working class movement as a whole, to the peculiarities of the concrete historical situation and to the problems immediately resulting from this situation.

This is all the more important today when the principle of internationalism needs to find its appropriate expression, not in the previous type of fixed forms of organisation, but in effective co-operation in the common struggle in such a way as to serve 'the fundamental political interest of the working class as a whole' at the same time as taking account of 'the peculiarities of the concrete historical situation' and the varying conditions in the different countries.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Co-operation Against Imperialism

The principle of internationalism is all the more imperative and urgent today, precisely because it does not depend on any automatic organisational expression, but lives and needs to live in the heart and conscience and understanding of every communist and every party. The class struggle is international. In the modern world situation the interlinking of the struggle is more than ever manifest. The cause of Vietnam has lit up the struggle in every country and among every people in the world. The forces of imperialism confront on a world scale the socialist camp, the international working class and the world of national liberation. The words of Marx in his speech at Amsterdam at the conclusion of The Hague Congress of the First International in 1872 ring as true as ever today:

> Let us recall the first principle of the International: solidarity. We shall achieve the great goal for which we are striving provided we firmly consolidate this life-giving principle among all workers in all countries.

Therefore it is a welcome first step in the present circumstances that the plan has gone forward, with the support of the large majority of communist parties, for an international conference of communist and workers' parties to promote solidarity and co-operation in the common struggle against imperialism.

Drawing the Balance

When the enemies of communism, in the face of its sweeping advance over these fifty years, seek to draw comfort from the divisions and problems which still remain to be solved, it is well to see in perspective the record of world capitalism over these fifty years. Lenin in that last speech of his to the international movement in 1922 made this contrast of the mistakes of communism and of capitalism:

> If the Bolsheviks do foolish things, the Bolshevik says: 'Twice two are five.' But when their enemies, the capitalists and the heroes of the Second International, do foolish things, they get: 'Twice two make a tallow candle.'

Where today are the grand wars of intervention which in the Churchillian phrase were to have strangled the Bolshevik chicken at birth? Where today is the Versailles design of Europe which was to have held Germany disarmed for ever and to have maintained the Eastern European states as a 'cordon sanitaire' against communism? Where today is the British Empire of which Lord Curzon boasted exactly fifty years ago?

> The British flag has never flown over a more powerful or a more united Empire. . . . Never did our voice count for more in the Councils of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Nations, or in determining the future destinies of mankind (Hear! Hear!). 'The world's great age begins anew; the golden years return.'
>
> (Lord Curzon in the House of Lords, November 18, 1918)

Where is President Hoover's final conquest of poverty and unemployment, which ended in the world economic crisis? Where is the 'Thousand Year Third Reich' which was built up with such lavish finance and arms by the Anglo-French-American millionaires as the invincible instrument against communism? Where is the boasted atom bomb monopoly or supremacy which was to have dictated terms to the Soviet Union? No need to continue the catalogue. The international situation is still dangerous. The madmen of reaction return to their vomit. Once again, in face of every lesson, they have rearmed German militarism. Once again they preach the old lie that parallel soaring armaments and sectional military treaties can guarantee peace. Once again their crazy economic system lurches into new dislocations, for which the workers have to pay. There was never such need for the active fight, vigilance, unity and strength of the working class and all democratic forces within each country and internationally. But at the same time the recognition of the bankruptcy of the old order and the need for basic change is extending among the widest sections. From Pakistan to Spain the earth is shaking. The stirring among young people is a sign of change, and a pointer to the great future which opens if political consciousness and clarity and class understanding is added to the desire for change.

'It Moves'

Dimitrov in the dock in 1933 confronted his Third Reich judge and Nazi prosecutor with the words of Galileo: 'And still it—the earth—moves.' In face of the attempts of the President of the Court to silence him he proclaimed the aims of the world communist revolution and declared:

> We Communists can now, no less resolutely than old Galileo, say: 'And still it moves! The wheel of history turns, moves forward.'

How much more we can say that today! **R.P.D.**

Correction (February issue, p. 57): The date of the Treasury Agreement between the Government and the trade unions suspending the right to strike and all trade union restrictions was in March, not February, 1915.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(1) HANDS OFF THE UNIONS!

Len Squire
National Officer, Transport and General Workers' Union

DIVIDE and conquer has for centuries been an accepted battle cry. The current campaign being waged against the trade union movement seems hell-bent on dividing the trade unions from the Labour Party by the introduction of even further restrictive legislation.

Despite the recommendation contained in the Donovan Report (Command 3623) the Government has still thought fit to introduce measures that Tory governments of the past would have loved to have brought about, but lacked the courage to attempt. There is nothing new in attacks on workers, their wages or their conditions; the only thing new about the recent attacks has been the quarters from which they come.

In September of last year the Trades Union Congress at Blackpool listened to Frank Cousins move Composite Motion Number 9:

> This Congress, recognising the extent to which legislation restricting wage and salary movements has hindered legitimate trade union activity, economic expansion and improvements in industrial efficiency, calls for the repeal of this legislation. It also rejects any further legislation the aim of which would be to curtail basic trade union rights.

In retrospect one could say the latter part of the Motion was indeed the sting in the tail.

If further legislation is needed, then there is a direction that this can take which would certainly meet with more approval than the intended legislation will—viz. more worker-participation in management. One of the outstanding changes which has served to highlight the need for forms of control is the way in which industry itself has radically altered in recent times. We have seen a rapid growth in the size of companies from national to international, each in its turn expanding the size and type of plant. This quite clearly has served to concentrate even further power into still fewer hands and to eliminate to a large degree such competition as may exist. The results of this process are all too often seen in greater manipulation of markets, costs and profits, and finally in greater domination of the country's economy. To counterbalance this power move, it has become necessary for the workers to play a far greater role in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

running of industry, including the right to hire and fire, and to take decisions that have any long-term effects. To play their full part successfully, they must know all about the problems an industry or firm is faced with, what the order book is like, what capital is available for investment, what the marketing forecast is, what effects on labour any expansion is likely to have, how those affected will be taken care of—to mention just a few of the items in which the workers themselves should have a real say.

Recognition of this theme has today come from many quarters. To quote one eminent speaker at the Annual Conference of the Institute of Directors in 1967:

> Britain cannot go on penalising her more gifted children, and industrial democracy means a nation in which men are equal in dignity and opportunity, but in which rewards go to effort, enterprise, brains, skill and qualification.

The speaker, not known as an industrial revolutionist, was none other than Quintin Hogg, and again the same vein ran through an article in *The Banker* of December 1966:

> A new philosophy of companies will need to recognise the fact that the organised power of labour today entitles the worker to a share in the control of industry. If the limited liability company is to survive as an effective institution, we need a philosophy of profitability that includes the workers, consumers and the community, as well as shareholders.

The seriousness of the position facing the trade union movement today is such that trade union branches throughout the country should be discussing in the greatest detail the effects of further legislation and the alternatives to it. There seems to me to be a tendency in many places to treat far too lightly the introduction of the legislation which led up to the present crisis and incomes policy. Surely some lessons have been learned. We have seen control of wages in operation, but very little control, if any, of prices, profits and dividends and certain other forms of so-called income.

Our experience in the working-class movement has taught us always to look ahead to avoid pitfalls, and looking ahead of the present position one shudders to think of the way in which the new anti-union legislation could be extended.

Now is the time when the voice of the organised workers must be raised and a halt called to the political window-dressing. It is time, too, to introduce real socialist planning, which would need no sales-gimmicks to make it acceptable to the workers of this country.

Let the present Government take serious note of the path they are travelling before they find themselves in a position from which they will find it difficult to extricate themselves.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(2)

Ben Birnbaum
Trade Union Executive Member

THE present Government, since coming to power, has by various means attempted to impose limitations on the struggle of the working class to improve its living conditions. The legislation proposed in the White Paper relating to strikes is a further step along this road.

The Government accepts that the solution to the problems facing British capitalism can only be accomplished at the expense of the people's living standards. Despite all the pressures placed upon them, the workers in many instances have forced their factory and national organisations to press for wage increases.

The working class's refusal to accept the whole burden of the crisis has forced the Government to consider alternative policies. The review of the East of Suez policy was not an accident but was greatly influenced by the wages struggle. The ruling class at the moment has no alternative area for compromise; this results in the present attack by the Government on the trade unions.

The aim is to solve the problem by the restructure and modernisation of industry in the interest of the capitalist class. The ruling class wishes to strengthen its position in the world markets and the imperialist alliance. When this has been achieved the workers may be given some crumbs, under present state intervention, only if both employers and Government agree. The new laws will be used to serve this purpose.

The proposals contain what are termed 'good points'. But, without the unrestricted right to struggle, the 'good' proposals will be dependent on the Government and the institutions it created for the purpose—hardly encouraging.

The prices and incomes policy was to help the lower paid and end the law of the jungle. The Government, by the Commission on Industrial Relations and other innovations, strengthened the most powerful animals in the capitalist jungle—the monopolies. And the trade unionists who supported it now admit that the low paid and weak are worse off. The laws are made in the interest of monopoly capital and applied in the same interests.

Without the proposed shackles, the 'good' proposals would, I think, be of marginal value in most industries and enterprises. Within the controls suggested, I doubt whether they have any value. The establishment of any negotiating machinery is determined by the relative strength of trade union organisation. To ensure the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

functioning of an agreed procedure over any length of time needs continuous pressure.

The White Paper says (paragraph 59) that where employers delay agreement by exploiting weak organisation—or a reluctance to strike—it will go to the industrial court. This, the Government believes, will terrify every employer and turn them into angels of the negotiating table. This is difficult to believe.

At the present moment, in thousands of establishments the Government cannot impose the application of what is laid down in the Factory Acts. This is only achieved in many instances by action.

The new laws will create an atmosphere of intimidation; it is within these conditions the Commission on Industrial Relations will operate. This will condition the demands made in the factory agreements proposed by Donovan, similar to the influence of the Prices and Incomes Board on wage demands. The weak factories will determine the level of all. The task of the strong factory to reach a good agreement would have been difficult enough under Donovan's proposals; the present law makes it almost impossible. Time can be decisive; a strike called two weeks late can be ten times more difficult to win.

In line with the legislation is a clear indication that the present type of productivity deals are not to be continuous repeat performances. Following a number of remarks on bargaining, Mr. George Cattel, Director of Manpower and Productivity Service at the Department of Employment and Productivity, had this to say:

> The general environment will be one in which management is free to make the best use of all its resources, free from the crippling effects of bargaining over each change in practice or method, free from the pressure of national wage negotiations and unpredictable or irrelevant sectional wage claims.
>
> (*The Times*, February 3, 1969)

Whether Mr. Cattel recognises it or not, such an environment can only come about by shackling the trade unions, by laws and institutions created for this purpose.

It is necessary to defeat this offensive if living conditions and civil liberties are to be maintained. The attacks on militant trade unionists, students and demonstrations are now becoming an attack on all who do not conform. The minimum we were entitled to expect from a Labour Government was policies and actions designed to improve working class standards. The opposite has taken place. In these conditions it is not a question of trying to save the Government from itself but of saving the working class movement and the people from the Government.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(3)

Ken Gill
Editor of *DATA Journal*

THE policy pursued by the Labour Government is anti-working class and consequently is the policy of monopoly capitalism. To say that the measures are 'anti-trade union' is inadequate.

The British workers at the present time, whether organised or not have only one great force between them and repression, and that force is the trade union movement. Let no one believe that the destruction or emasculation of national unions can easily be countered by the building of unofficial factory organisations. The ability of workers through their shop stewards to make advances is only possible with the actual or potential might of their trade union behind them. The vacillations and class collaboration of some trade union leaders does not alter this fact.

The government has attacked in two directions. Firstly on the national organisations by the enforced strike ballot, and the pressure on executives for co-operation inside the State machinery, undertaken so readily in some quarters. Secondly, and more important, the new and massive threat to shop-floor organisation, the legal sanctions, the cooling-off period, the destruction of shop-floor bargaining by bringing this basic workers' method into the orbit of State control.

It is not enough to respond to these attacks in a formal way by simply calling for resolutions to Members of Parliament and for deputations to the TUC. The left wing inside parliament is meaningless unless it expresses the voice of action outside. The Labour Party must understand that it will be destroyed if it continues to express the demands of British capitalism. The fight must be in the factories and offices for a larger share of industry's wealth. Action must be taken on every issue, and workers mobilised to fight for wages, in every plant. We should reject the concept of wage increases for productivity increases. (Capitalism will improve productivity anyway, if there is profit in it—and there is!) Trade union organisations at district and national level must be faced with the realities of fighting for their members' interests, by supporting them in their struggle with their employers. If the fight is developed, national organisations will have to stand by the resolutions adopted by their conferences. This will help to sweep away the vain trappings of TUC incomes policy and the reluctance for the resolution against trade union legislation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is surely of significance that during the period of 'freeze', 'restraint', 'zero norm' and '3½ per cent norm', where workers have fought, they have won. Where they have been supported by their union, that union has been strengthened. The Government has not succeeded in checking any advance, has not been able to impose 'orders' or legal action when faced by solidarity and working class power. From the Liverpool dock strike to the Post Office Workers' dispute, determination has left the employers and Government in disarray. The danger of the present White Paper is that it would enable the ruling class to corrode the strength of wide sections of the trade union movement until it had isolated the vanguard sections. A *coup de grace* could be administered, possibly by a Tory government, and a big step would be taken toward a corporate State.

It is worth recalling that these anti-working class measures are being taken *because of the growing strength of trade unionism*. That strength must be used in fighting the employers and their supporters, whether Barbara Castle or Edward Heath. It is no longer possible to accept laws or to soft-pedal opposition because a Labour government is in power.

Unless these policies are destroyed, there cannot be a Labour government after the next election. If the policies stay, then a Tory government will use them to murder the British Labour Movement. Not only will British workers refuse to support a party which serves their everyday enemy, but trade union leaders tempted by positions within the State apparatus, or fascinated by the prospect of a docile membership, would do well to remember that those workers will not subscribe to trade unions or leaders who have abandoned the struggle on their behalf.

LABOUR MONTHLY FORTY YEARS AGO

For a decade the mining industry has been the central problem confronting British capitalist society; it has been *the* 'post-war' problem *par excellence*. Coal was the basis of British capitalism's prosperity in its hey-day. It is equally the basic factor in British capitalism's decline. Fundamentally the crisis in the mining industry has been unbroken for the past ten years; and more than any other industry has coal shown with complete clearness that the economic problems of capitalism today are essentially political problems, that is to say problems which involve the whole question of class power.

(From 'Coal, Charity and the Class Struggle,' by Allen Hutt, *Labour Monthly*, March 1929.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDUARDO MONDLANE

M. P. Naicker
Editor, *Sechaba*, official organ of the
African National Congress of South Africa

DR. EDUARDO MONDLANE, President of the Liberation Front of Mozambique (FRELIMO), who was assassinated on February 3, first came to public attention when he was expelled from South Africa in 1948 whilst studying at Witwatersrand University. The reasons for his expulsion were his activity as member of the African National Congress Youth League and in particular his leading role in the formation of the African Students' Association at the University.

Later Dr. Mondlane was thrown amongst revolutionary students in Lisbon and Paris. He completed his studies and became Professor of Sociology at Syracuse University, New York. There he met and married an American girl, Janet. They had three children.

Later he worked in the United Nations where he did much to expose conditions in the Portuguese colonies in hearings before the Trusteeship Committee.

In 1962, he abandoned teaching to assume leadership of the Mozambique revolution, after three clandestine Mozambican organisations—UDENAMO, UNAMI and MANU—were fused into a single organisation—the Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO).

Under the leadership of Dr. Mondlane, FRELIMO has liberated one-fifth of the country and at present FRELIMO's fighting force is 15,000 strong. The liberated areas have seen the translation of the political and economic ideas of FRELIMO in action: an elaborate structure of democratic organs of self-government have been set up in all the liberated areas; an intensive educational programme has been embarked upon and agricultural changes are bringing in increased production to the peasants who enthusiastically support the revolution.

Little wonder that the Portuguese authorities, and their secret police—PIDE—in particular, described him as Portugal's most wanted man. There is little doubt who his murderers are. But if they think that the struggle in Mozambique will be halted because of the death of this people's leader, then they are in for a rude shock. The fighting people of Mozambique have been steeled in struggle and they will avenge the death of their leader in the battlefield.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Women protest against Means Test, 1931

For the last 100 years women have been struggling against the subjectio conditions in which to live, work and bring up their children. Sometimes att times on the universities where equal access to higher education was limite always there was the struggle to obtain equal pay and equality of opportunity. to political conditions in the country. In the USA in 1908 a group of prog of Katherine Hepburn, the film actress) organised an historic demonstration view. The demonstration made a great impression on the world. An interna Copenhagen in 1910. The activities of the American women were reported ar when women throughout the world could meet to express their common religion and political opinion, and could pledge with each other to carry on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Women march for peace today

ich class society condemns them. Their demands have been for reasonable as been focused on the fight to end bad conditions in the factories; some- occasionally on the conditions of work of the mother and housewife; and ıe struggle was taking place in all countries, more or less actively according vomen (prominent among them Mother Bloor and Mrs. Hepburn—mother vote. At that time it meant converting 48 different State legislatures to their onference of women was held under the chairmanship of Klara Zetkin in s decided to celebrate March 8th as International Women's Day—a day d aspirations, and their solidarity with each other despite differences of ggle for peace and a better world for their children.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WILSON'S BONN VISIT

Quaestor

BY the time these lines are printed, Mr. Wilson will have paid his visit to Bonn. The press did not hesitate to say beforehand what the talks with the West German Federal Chancellor, Dr. Kiesinger, would include. Co-operation in producing enriched uranium raw material for nuclear research—and nuclear bombs—by a new and cheaper method (*Observer*, February 2); co-operation by Messerschmidts, of World War II fame, and British Aircraft Corporation, in a £2,000 m. scheme for building a new variable-wing 'strike' aircraft to serve both Luftwaffe and R.A.F. (*Guardian*, February 5); co-operation in a 'European' (the lying title for Anglo-Franco-German) 'airbus', to cost Britain alone over £120 m., on which the West German Government is so determined that it will co-operate with France alone if Britain withdraws (*The Times*, February 6). But in addition, said a Foreign Office spokesman on February 1, there would be 'political questions', and among these would be West Germany's continuing resistance to signing the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and Nato plans for the 'initial use of nuclear weapons in a number of typical situations'—plans which have already been worked on by Britain and West Germany, according to Denis Healey, Defence Minister, speaking at a conference on military science in Munich (*Sunday Times*, February 2).

Before considering the meaning of this agenda, it as well to recall once more the essential facts about West Germany.

It is a country where the President, Lübke, played a responsible part in building Nazi concentration camps: where the Chancellor (Prime Minister) took an active part in Nazi radio propaganda: where the Defence Minister Schroeder—Christian Democrat candidate for President next election—was a Nazi storm-trooper: and where the Government as a whole has jibbed at legal action to suppress the clearly neo-Nazi 'National Democratic Party' because its leaders have publicly threatened in that event to publish documents exposing the Nazi past of other highly-placed Bonn politicians (in a recent court case at Hanover, the NDP leader von Thadden himself was proved to have held a Nazi party card, number 7,155,833 from September 1, 1939—contrary to his repeated denials). It is also a country where ex-Nazis are exceptionally numerous among high military men, judges, police chiefs, and prosecutors—and where there is a swelling output of newspapers, books and pamphlets

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whitewashing the Nazis and the wars they waged from 1936 to 1945, blackguarding Jews and anti-fascists. It is a country where the two leading parties in Parliament—Social Democrats as well as Christian Democrats—have agreed to force through a Preventive Detention Bill essentially similar to Hitler's (its first reading began on January 25): and in keeping the Communist Party of Germany banned. Finally, it is a country where these forces—revenge-seeking, neo-Nazi and militarist, as the Czechoslovak Premier, Oldrich Cernik, called them when setting forth his Government programme in the Federal Assembly at Prague on January 30—have at their disposal the most massive and up-to-date heavy industry, and the biggest armed forces, in capitalist Europe: and where their Government has for months used every conceivable pretext to avoid signing the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Their representatives at the Munich meeting called it a 'dangerous proposal', 'incompatible with the spirit of Nato' (*The Times* Bonn correspondent, February 6)—thus keeping their hands free for nuclear arming by subterfuge.

This is the Government with whom Harold Wilson set out to discuss yet bigger sources of material for nuclear development, yet more powerful fighter aircraft, yet bigger transport planes, innocently described as 'airbuses'. To talk of the Gadarene swine in this context is to do rank injustice to poor dumb animals.

Of course, when diplomacy is laid aside, the assumption is the same as in the days of Stanley Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain, thirty and forty years ago—that all this power of destruction, suppression and falsehood can be turned against the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries. It was not a mere slip of the tongue that made Air Marshal Sir Lewis Hodges, C.I.C. Air Support Command, when asked why the RAF needed this new 'strike' aircraft, reply that it was required 'to penetrate increasingly elaborate East European defences' (*Guardian* Defence Correspondent, February 5). Mr. Healey vigorously took up the tale at that same Munich conference. Loftily ignoring the crying facts—that the Nato countries have 100 m. men of military age, as against the 63 m. of the Warsaw Pact countries: and that Nato defence expenditure at £45,000 m. sterling vastly exceeds that of the Warsaw countries—Healey raised the alarm about the latter's 'superiority' in conventional arms, which must lead either to 'complete surrender' or to nuclear war, 'in the case of a major attack by the Russians'. Thus, once again, he dragged out that Soviet bogey, so brazenly used by the liars twenty years ago to justify the creation of Nato—and admitted to be a bogey, with such shameless effrontery, during recent years. No

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wonder *The Times*, in an editorial on February 3, called it 'a highly conjectural case'. This is all the more noteworthy because all the farcical outcry about the 'Soviet naval build-up in the Mediterranean' a few months ago, apart from its vicious propaganda effect, resulted only in the promise of an 'on-call' force of a few destroyers from four countries to reinforce the already overwhelmingly strong United States Sixth Fleet, which has been there for years: 'half a symbol' as the *Economist* jeered (January 25).

The main *practical* result of Healey's outburst for the moment, therefore, could only be to encourage the aggressive forces dominating the West German Government, for whom Nato is not a restraint, as official cant makes out, but rather an extra means of gaining their ends, as their gradual rearming over these twenty years has shown. And indeed the *Daily Telegraph* Bonn correspondent (February 10) repeated that among German officials 'the reputation of Mr. Healey has soared'.

There has been one subtle variety of such encouragement, moreover, which has made its appearance. Whenever, since the war, there has been a danger of peaceful relations between the USA and the Soviet Union 'breaking out', there has invariably appeared a delicate manoeuvre from Whitehall aiming to drop a careful spanner in the works. True to the tradition, Mr. Healey told journalists at Munich (*The Times*, February 3) that it was urgent to have greater co-operation among the European countries within Nato 'to help the American Administration *to resist pressures which may be exerted on it for a reduction in American commitment to Nato*' (my italics) 'by putting a collective European view on this question'. Not a word of the Soviet proposals last July for reduction of armaments *all round*—not only in Nato but in Warsaw countries too. Not a word of the renewed Soviet offer, made on January 20 this year, 'to sit down at a conference table with United States representatives, in order to discuss reciprocal limitation and subsequent reduction of offensive and defensive nuclear weapons, as soon as the Nixon Administration declares its readiness to do so'. Pressures, indeed! What Mr. Healey's phrases meant was pressures on the USA not to agree to any such talks: and of course (the *Daily Telegraph* man reported) the Germans supported him.

One doesn't have to probe the tortuous recesses of the Defence Secretary's mind to realise that, if his outburst on February 2 had been expressly designed to blot out all recollection of the Soviet offers in Britain and America, it would not have been put otherwise. And it should not escape notice that Mr. Wilson said in Parliament

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on February 6 that 'Mr. Healey's speech was fully in accordance with the Government's policy'. Moreover, on the very same day, as though to underline the point, when it was announced that the USA had agreed to the French and Soviet proposal of Four-Power talks about restoring peace in the Middle East, Mr. Stewart, speaking as Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary at the Council of West European Union (Nato without the USA) in Luxembourg, invited West Germany, Italy and the three 'Benelux' countries to a joint discussion in London the following week, for 'detailed talks on the Middle East'. These, delegates told the *Daily Telegraph* correspondent there (that cautious journalist didn't say whether Mr. Stewart himself was among them, but one may guess), 'could enable Western Europe to speak with one voice on the Middle East and *exercise more influence over America and Russia and Middle East countries*' (*Daily Telegraph*, February 7: my italics). Once again, a danger of 'peace breaking out' in the Middle East between the USA and USSR, so Britain's Nato partners are called in to 'exercise more influence': on whose side? No prizes offered for the answer, bearing in mind the marked lack of enthusiasm shown in Whitehall for the Four-Power talks until the USA had spoken. And would you be surprised to learn that in Bonn the proposal was well liked too? Or that de Gaulle has revolted against the scheme?

Thus at every turn the ignoble role of the Labour Government, as an inflamer instead of reducer of world tensions, shows itself—and with it, the desperate peril of the British people continuing to allow themselves to be dragged, by means of Nato, nearer to war—at the tail of the German military and Great-Power adventurers who have already plunged Europe into war three times in the last ninety years, and who still have powerful allies in Washington.

PASS IT ON . . .

When you've finished reading this copy of Labour Monthly, why not pass it on to a friend or workmate?

You might gain us a new reader — especially if you point out the generous post free subscription rates printed inside the back cover.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE KHARTOUM CONFERENCE—A LANDMARK

Dr. Yusuf Dadoo
Member of the African National Congress
(South African) Delegation

THE Conference held in Khartoum, the capital of Sudan, from January 18-20 in support of the peoples of the Portuguese Colonies and Southern Africa marked a big step forward in consolidating international support for the armed struggles now going on in Africa against colonialism and white supremacy regimes.

This Conference, sponsored jointly by the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organisation and the World Council of Peace in collaboration with the six authentic national liberation movements waging armed struggle, was attended by representatives and experts from more than fifty countries as well as from a number of international organisations. The list of participants was a very imposing one. Delegations from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam carrying a message of solidarity from Ho Chi Minh and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam came there to demonstrate the oneness of the struggle against imperialism and colonialism whether it is carried on in Vietnam or Southern Africa. Asian delegations included representatives from India, Ceylon, Pakistan, Japan, Korea, Laos. All the socialist countries with the exception of China and Albania were represented by their solidarity organisations. From the Americas representatives came from USA, Canada, Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Mexico and Paraguay. The Middle East and North Africa countries were fully represented. Europe was represented by delegates from Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, Sweden, Finland, Spain and Portugal.

It is a sad commentary on the existing political state of affairs on the African continent that, despite strenuous efforts by the sponsors, independent Africa was very poorly represented. But there were delegations from Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia and Madagascar.

Recognising the importance of international solidarity action for the cause of the struggle, the top-most leaders of the six national liberation movements came in person to give the conference a first-hand, factual report on the situation in their respective territories, the progress on the battle-fronts and the position in the liberated areas.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Portuguese Colonies: Powerful delegations from Guinea Bissau, Angola and Mozambique were headed by Amilcar Cabral, PAIGC, Agostinho Neto, MPLA, and Eduardo Mondlane, who has since been so shamefully assassinated, of FRELIMO. They spoke of the fascist terror and repression let loose on the people by the Portuguese colonialists. They gave a sober but heartening account of the valour and skill of the armed guerrilla fighters who with the aid of the local populations were able to beat back the Portuguese army and liberate vast areas in the three territories concerned. In Guinea Bissau, over two-thirds of the territory has been liberated and the Portuguese troops driven back to find refuge in a few towns left to them. In Angola, a third of the area has been freed and in Mozambique, over one-fifth. About a quarter of a million Portuguese troops are now bogged down in the three African territories in a desperate attempt to halt the advancing tide of the freedom fighters.

Evidence was laid before the Conference that, but for the economic and military aid rendered to Portugal by the Nato powers, the Portuguese colonial administrations in Africa could have collapsed.

South Africa: The report on South Africa was presented through several papers submitted by the delegation of the African National Congress of South Africa. The report on Apartheid—*The World Must Act Now*—was given by the leader of the delegation, Robert M. Resha, and the other papers dealt with such questions as Bases of South African Imperialism, Race and Apartheid Power, Political Prisoners, and the Role of Women.

These papers laid bare the facts that South Africa today is a highly developed imperialist state and with the support of Britain, US, West Germany and other powers, is engaged in a vigorous drive to take over imperialist responsibilities in Africa; that, in alliance with the Smith regime in Rhodesia and the fascist regime of Portugal, she constitutes a serious and direct threat to world peace.

As Robert Resha correctly pointed out in his report: the fascist Republic of South Africa 'is forcibly intervening in Zimbabwe to sustain the illegal Smith regime in face of a popular revolution—this is an act of invasion of what is supposed to be a British colony. It is extending its attempt at economic, political and military domination from neighbouring Lesotho, Swaziland and Botswana northwards, first to Malawi, but with the object of penetrating all independent African States. South Africa has made blatant threats against Zambia and Tanzania. *Fascist South Africa is as much a threat to the peace, security and independence of the continent of Africa today, as was the Hitler regime to Europe thirty years ago.*'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Armed struggle in Southern Africa: Both the report of the ANC and that of the Zimbabwe African People's Union presented by Stephen Nkomo dealt with the guerrilla war waged in Zimbabwe since 1967 under the ANC/ZAPU military alliance. These reports show, within the bounds of security, the extent of the penetration within the country by the guerrilla forces and bases established there with the active help and co-operation of the local population. The Smith regime unable to rely on its own police and soldiers had to run to South Africa to seek more military support.

These reports also describe the desperate situation in which the Smith regime found itself as a result of the blows of the guerrilla war and the unleashing of a reign of terror and persecution of the unarmed African population, subjecting the innocent villagers to the most ruthless forms of torture and murder.

Namibia (South West Africa): The repression of the population by the savage application of the Apartheid laws to the territory by the fascist regime of South Africa, in flagrant defiance of UN came in for strong condemnation in the report of Sam Nujomo, President of SWAPO. The report also dealt with the large scale plunder of the wealth of the country and the ruthless exploitation of cheap labour by South African and foreign monopolies.

It also dealt with the guerrilla activities embarked upon by the Namibia Liberation Army, the military wing of SWAPO, since the beginning of armed struggle in 1966.

These reports of the national liberation movements together with fact papers on imperialist economic, political and military involvements in the Portuguese colonies and Southern Africa, on 'Neo-Colonialism, Military Coups and African Liberation', 'British Involvement in South Africa' and on solidarity actions, submitted by the British Anti-Apartheid Movement, Jack Woddis, the International Defence and Aid, the Soviet and GDR delegations, were considered in some detail by the three commissions in which the Conference divided itself.

After two full days of deliberation, the commissions produced three resolutions which were unanimously adopted at the final plenary session amidst acclamation.

A clarion call to all the democratic forces for all-out solidarity was contained in the Declaration which stated *inter alia*:

> We meet at a time when the forces of National Liberation, enjoying the support of the forces of progress and socialism, are challenging the aggressive forces of imperialism, colonialism and racism and are scoring new victories for their freedom, independence and social progress.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> We met to face the challenge to Africa and to humanity presented by Portuguese colonialism and the white supremacy regimes of Southern Africa. . . .
>
> We have decided with unanimity that Africa and the world give more effective help to the African Liberation Movements fighting for the freedom of their peoples. Coming to Khartoum from all over Europe, from Asia, from America, North and South, we solemnly resolve that this Khartoum Conference shall prove a historic new stage of advance in Africa's march to freedom, independence and unity.
>
> The existence of these racialist regimes, their aggressive alliance, and their economic, financial, political and military support by imperialism constitute a major threat to world peace. . . .
>
> The Conference calls upon the progressive, anti-imperialist forces of the entire world to back the armed struggles which have been forced upon them as the only possible alternative to slavery for the foreseeable future.

The resolution on mobilisation of international support itemises no less than 24 practical measures which national committees and solidarity organisations in different parts can undertake in order to render the fullest moral, political and material support. (This resolution is summarised in the accompanying document.)

The militant spirit, reflected in the Declaration, was characteristic of the Conference and at the end of the Conference delegates left Khartoum with the firm conviction that much that was positive was attained after three days of business-like deliberation and hard work.

The Conference not only demonstrated the unity of purpose and action of the national liberation movements in this new period of armed struggle but also underlined the imperative need for building the force of united international mobilisation in support of the liberation movement.

Much ground-work has been done for the laying of a sound foundation for lasting alliance between all progressive forces and democratic organisations of the four continents, and for establishing links between the African liberation movement and the movement for social progress in the whole world.

Out of the Conference emerged a better and more clear understanding of the role of the socialist community as a most vital factor in the struggle of all peoples for national independence, social progress and peace. The invaluable disinterested aid and assistance rendered by the socialist countries and above all by the Soviet Union was publicly and gratefully acknowledged by the spokesmen of the national liberation movements as well as by many other participants.

What was most gratifying was the pledge given by the delegations

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the socialist countries of their continuing assistance which was made doubly reassuring by the following words of the leader of the Soviet delegation:—'As regards the Soviet people, they will spare no effort in rendering every possible aid to the national liberation movement in attaining the noble goals of liberation.'

There is no doubt that the spirit of Khartoum will permeate all lands and the four continents from whence the participants came and it is now the responsibility of the democratic, anti-imperialist, revolutionary and peace forces everywhere to transform the recommendations for solidarity into reality and render full moral, political, financial and material support to the national liberation movements.

Conference Document

THE RESOLUTION issued by the Mobilisation Committee after the conference recorded the developments reached by the National Liberation struggles in the territories of Africa dominated by Portugal (i.e. Angola, Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea and Cape Verde).

It was noted that Portugal represents the weakest link in the imperialist chain and that the intensification of the international struggle against Portuguese colonialism and fascism is a matter of urgent priority.

South Africa is the main pillar in Africa supporting colonial and racist régimes, while Britain continues to entrench its agents, the Rhodesian racist régime, in oppressing the African people of Zimbabwe.

The following practical measures in support of the peoples' liberation struggle were among those recommended by the Conference:

1. Celebration of the solidarity days of the National Liberation Movements by mass demonstrations. These are: February 4 (Angola), March 17 (Zimbabwe), May 25 (Africa), June 26 (South Africa), August 3 (Portuguese Guinea and Cape Verde), August 26 (Namibia), September 25 (Mozambique).
2. Recognition by all governments of the following fighting movements as the sole legitimate authorities of the respective countries: MPLA (Angola), PAIGC (Guinea-Bissau), FRELIMO (Mozambique), ANC (South Africa), SWAPO (South-West Africa), ZAPU (Zimbabwe).
3. Boycott of all Portuguese, Rhodesian and South African goods.
4. Implementation by all governments of the UN resolutions regarding Zimbabwe, South Africa, S. W. Africa and Portuguese colonies.
5. Intensification of all measures for the political, economic, diplomatic and cultural isolation of South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal.
6. Campaigns for the release of all political prisoners, and for prisoners taken in the course of the national liberation struggle to be considered as prisoners of war and treated in accordance with the Geneva Convention.
7. Collection of material to aid the National Liberation Movements, especially funds, vehicles, medicines, clothing, blankets, foodstuffs.
8. Organising by governments and international bodies of medical teams for serivce in the liberated areas.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IMMIGRANTS AND THE VOTE

Enid Lakeman
Director, Electoral Reform Society

IRELAND is a warning and a guide. A warning from north of the Border of what could happen here too; a hint from south of it on how to save ourselves. Each part of Ireland has its religious minority, and in the Six Counties we have been witnessing the revolt of a minority that feels itself to be separate (and unequal), is treated by the majority as separate, and has no voice in government—only in opposition. We are witnessing also the resistance of a majority that is frightened; fearful of losing its dominant position and unable to contemplate sharing power. Hence the civil rights marches.

And in England the coloured immigrants march. They also are separate. They also too often feel unequal and are treated by the white majority as unequal. Most people will admit this to be wrong: we may or may not allow people from other lands to make their home among us, but if we do admit them we must give them the same rights as all other permanent residents. Including the right to a say in how they shall be governed—including, that is to say, representation in the bodies that run our national and local affairs. If they find themselves excluded from that activity, our coloured Britishers are going to kick, as Catholic Northern Irishmen are kicking.

What prospect is there that they will get their fair voice in national or local government? Not, to all appearance, very much. There is no coloured MP, and the adoption of a coloured candidate for parliament is an extreme rarity. But there is a Negro on the Greater London Council and there are others on some London borough councils; as we shall see, that gives a clue to what should be done.

The recent immigrant, naturally enough, understands little of British politics and tends to stand aside, but it is neither likely nor desirable that he should continue to do so. He ought to play his part in the politics of the land he has made his home, but how will he do so? The signs so far have been rather unwelcome. On the one hand we have had talk of candidates sponsored by coloured people's organisations and standing expressly in their interests; on the other hand, the Sikhs some time ago turned their attention to the influence they could exert on the election of white candidates; they number about 100,000 and could affect the result in a dozen

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

constituencies. In a close election like that of 1964, this would be amply sufficient to decide which party formed the government.

We have seen enough of the harm associated with racial parties in other countries and do not want them here. A Negro in this country has a few special interests as a Negro, but many more as a human being with a home, a job, children to be educated and so forth and ideas about what sort of government is most likely to provide the environment in which he likes to live. He should be playing his part in one of the parties that concern themselves with all these matters, not in one limited to the one question of Negro rights or even the broader question of non-white rights. Nor do we want participation in party activity to be on the lines contemplated by the Sikhs. It is right that 100,000 people should have representation, but it is not right that they should have the power to settle what kind of government there shall be for the whole 54 million of us.

How can we enable immigrants to play their part in public life through the same political parties as the rest of us? Well, how did Dr. Pitt get on to the GLC? He was nominated as one of the three Labour candidates for the borough of Hackney. Would he have been nominated as the one Labour candidate for any one of the three parliamentary constituencies within that borough? It seems very improbable. A party trying to collect as many votes as possible will not risk offending the white voters, who after all are the majority, by excluding them from representation; if it is a matter of either/or, a white candidate will get the nomination every time. Especially is that true in the very places where coloured immigrants are numerous and therefore best entitled to representation; some party might conceivably choose a candidate in some place where there are few immigrants and little colour prejudice, but it will not take that risk in Brixton or Birmingham. But with three seats to be shared in one constituency, whites have no reasonable cause to object if one goes to a black, while a large black minority has cause for complaint if it does not, and a party therefore has an inducement to include candidates of both colours.

Thus, multi-member constituencies give coloured people (or women, or Jews, or any other supposedly vote-losing type of candidate) a much better chance of representation than do single-member constituencies.

That, however, is far from enough. Multi-member constituencies, as we have them for example in London's local government, have notorious disadvantages, of which the most conspicuous is that, almost always, all the seats go to one party, whose worst candidate

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is elected with nearly the same number of votes as its best. To avoid those drawbacks and get the maximum benefit, we need also to vote by a different method.

In that Hackney election, Dr. Pitt polled 16,080 votes; his two Labour colleagues got 17,182 and 15,623 votes respectively—only one Labour voter in every ten appeared to think one Labour candidate was any better than another, and even that is a much larger fraction than in many other cases (e.g. in Hammersmith the corresponding figure was 1 in 100 for Labour, 1 in 250 for Conservatives). This is inevitable, so long as the voter who wishes to support a particular party can do so only by giving equal X's to all of that Party's candidates. A Labour voter in Hackney might be a great admirer of Dr. Pitt, but he could not show this except by voting for him and ignoring the party's other two candidates. Or he might be a white racialist but he could not show this either, except by leaving out Dr. Pitt and thereby possibly contributing to the election of a candidate of an opposing party. Contrast this with any election in the Republic of Ireland—say, Dun Laoghaire and Rathdown (4 members) in the 1965 election to the Dail. Votes cast for candidates of the two main parties were as follows:

Fianna Fail	7,932	Fine Gael	9,696
	5,312		2,780
	4,680		1,816

This very different pattern is due to the fact that each Irish elector has only ONE vote, which goes in the first instance to the candidate that voter has marked '1'. A voter numbers candidates in the order of his preference, so, while he probably starts with all the candidates of one party, he must indicate that he prefers one of those candidates to the rest. The effect of this system is therefore not only to give the parties their fair share of seats (two each in this case) but also to cause those seats to be filled by those individual candidates whom the voters prefer. One possible reason for preferring to be represented by candidate A rather than by candidate B of the same party is that A is of the same religion as yourself, while B is not. In this Irish election, one candidate in each of the two main parties was a Protestant; therefore, a voter belonging to the Protestant minority could express his wish for Protestant representation in the Dail by voting 1 for his party's Protestant candidate and 2, 3 for the Catholic ones. Or, if he felt very strongly about his religion, he could vote 2 for the Protestant in the other Party, before coming back to the Catholics of his own.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The same thing would apply to blacks and whites in Britain. If the 3-member Greater London borough of Hackney were also a 3-member parliamentary constituency, instead of being split into three, and used the single transferable vote as in Ireland, each party large enough to have hopes of winning more than one seat would be likely to include both black and white candidates (and if it did not do so, the group left out could insist on nominating one, there being no possibility of 'splitting the vote') and anyone wishing to be represented by someone of his own race would just vote first for a candidate of that race in the party he favoured. There would be nothing racially exclusive about this vote, for he would be encouraged to consider the fact that among candidates of the other race there were some worth voting for (whether because they belonged to the right party or for some other reason), and to vote accordingly. In New York, under this system, it was found that race tended to take a back seat as compared with party—a voter who voted first for, say, a Negro Democrat was much more likely to vote second for a white Democrat than for a Negro Republican. The system encourages a developing interest in political ideas and decreasing concern with racial or other divisions.

Its adoption in this country is highly desirable for many reasons, but the threat of racial conflict makes this reform much more urgent than it would otherwise be.

NEW MANAGING EDITOR

WE have received a number of applications for the post of Managing Editor since our announcement last month that Roger Woddis would be leaving to take up a full-time writing assignment.

After careful consideration the Editorial Board has appointed Nicola Seyd, who has worked for two and a half years as Secretary to the Co-ordinating Committee of Overseas Student Organisations.

Roger, who will continue to serve on the Editorial Board, writes: 'It is a personal wrench having to leave *LM*, especially at a time when we have such a vital role to play in the battle for trade union freedom. But I know that I leave the managing editorship in good hands; I wish Nicola all success.'

The Editorial Board thanks Roger Woddis for his invaluable contribution to the work of our journal, and warmly welcomes Nicola Seyd to her new and responsible post.

Editorial Board

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MIDDLE EAST: THE PATH TO PEACE

Tawfiq Toubi
Member of Knesset
(Israeli Parliament)

(The first part of this article, dealing with the aggressive expansionist policies of the Israeli Government, appeared in the February issue of Labour Monthly.)

THE annexationist plans of the Israeli ruling circles, as well as the calculations of the grand imperialist circles, do not accord with the realities of life itself.

One important factor has undermined these calculations—the basic relations of forces in the world are not to the advantage of imperialism and its allies, but to the advantage of the forces of socialism and national liberation. True, the June war has caused serious harm and damage to the interests of peace in the region, has inflicted great sacrifices upon the people of Israel and created serious difficulties for the Arab peoples and for the anti-imperialist forces in the region, against whom the blow was aimed.

However, the main aim of the blow (to undermine the anti-imperialist regimes in the region and place pro-imperialist protégés in the UAR and Syria) was not achieved, thanks to the role played by the Soviet Union and other socialist states in giving support to the victims of imperialist scheming, and thanks to the strength of the anti-imperialist popular mass movement in the Arab countries. Things then started to take a different direction of development not to the liking of the US imperialists nor the militarists of Israel, nor internal Arab reaction, who did not abandon their schemes to institute collaborating and obedient regimes in the Arab countries.

On June 7, 1968, the official *Davar* wrote:

> Every day that passes while Israel sits on the Suez, on the Jordan and over Damascus, shortens by two days the length of life of these regimes. . . . At least concerning Nasser and the 'Ba'ath', it is better for Israel if they go.

Internal reaction in all the Arab countries is exploiting, together with imperialism, the pressure and difficulties created by the Israeli occupation of territories in Egypt, Jordan and Syria; the military actions undertaken now and then are calculated also to undermine their prestige and positions, particularly of the present UAR Government. Nevertheless, the results of the bitter internal struggle within

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Arab countries themselves and on the Arab front as a whole show that the developments have been, notwithstanding serious difficulties and shortcomings, to the detriment of the positions of US imperialism and its Middle East allies.

Indications coming from various sources show that the US rulers are re-examining their tactics and policy in the region, not out of a change of heart or change of aims in the region, but as a result of the losses suffered and the danger of further losses to US interests if the present line of bullying the Arab countries through open Israeli aggression is continued. The continuing of the present situation, while weakening in the last resort the friends of the US imperialists in the Arab region, is at the same time strengthening the ties of the Arab countries with the Soviet Union, to the benefit of the cause of peace, the peoples' independence and social progress in the area. This is common knowledge now.

The recent study-visit of Nixon's special envoy, W. Scranton, to the Middle East countries was marked by his call for a 'more balanced' US policy in the region; and the announcement by the new US Ambassador to the UN, Charles Yost, that it is time the big powers worked for an agreed settlement of the Middle East crisis, caused serious concern in Israeli official circles.

News about contacts between the USSR and the USA and other big powers (Britain and France) in an effort to work for an agreed settlement of the Middle East crisis, based on the implementation of the UN Security Council resolution, have drawn angry and nervous comments from Israeli official circles.

Calling such settlements 'enforced settlements' . . . 'enforced from outside', Israeli leaders have declared their determination to oppose them.

Warning against such international efforts, *Davar* (December 24, 1968), the semi-official Israeli paper, wrote:

> In Jerusalem it is pointed out that since the end of the war three efforts were made for a Soviet-American agreement and the three efforts created dangerous situations for the future of Israel's policy. . . .

While US policy in the Middle East is under strong pressure, due to various factors including the experience of failure, to steer away from the course of fully backing the official Israeli policy of force and occupation and thus allow a peaceful settlement of the present crisis, it is still manoeuvring to exploit to the maximum continued Israeli occupation of Arab territory. Moreover, American imperialist scheming in the Middle East continues to give support to the Israeli militarists, and the 'Phantom' deal indicates this. Never-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theless, the very thought by the Israeli militarists that they may face a situation which will force them to retreat from the occupied territories and accept a settlement by peaceful means in accordance with the Security Council resolution, as a result of joint international efforts, drives them to over-strained positions and even to actions very dangerous to the peace of the region and the world.

Minister of Foreign Affairs, Aba Eban, when receiving envoy Scranton, tried, as reported in the Israeli press, to pin US attention to the dangers of 'Soviet intervention' in the affairs of the region, explaining 'the necessity of continued US assistance to Israel in order to maintain military balance, and the importance of deterring the USSR from interfering in the Arab-Israeli conflict, all this of course being in the vital interests of the USA.'

M. Dayan repeated such 'advice' to the US during his visit there last month. He declared in a public speech that:

> The key for the renewal of war is in the hands of the USSR, while in the hands of the USA is the key for preventing the renewal of war. This the USA can do in two ways: by supplying us with weapons which we cannot produce, and by influencing the Soviets not to interfere in the region. If these two elements are given, it would be possible to prevent war and lay the foundations of peace. (*Ha'aretz*, December 15, 1968.)

So M. Dayan sees two elements for 'maintaining peace' in the area: continued American support to the Israeli policy of strength, and the USA raising its club in the face of the USSR to enable the Israeli ruling circles to advance their own expansionist designs and thus best serve the interests of US imperialism. M. Dayan does not hesitate to say openly on the same occasion, whetting the appetite of the US imperialists:

> It is to be regretted that the USA has no good relations with the Arab countries at a time when the Soviets are increasing their influence in some of these countries. . . . I hope that a way will be found to increase US influence in the region. . . . The USA has good relations with Saudi Arabia and I would like to see American influence increase in Egypt, Iraq and Syria. . . . (*Ha'aretz*, December 15, 1968.)

The ruling circles of Israel leave no doubt as to the preference they give to renewal of war and their reluctance to renounce their new conquests.

Many in Israel and abroad interpreted the recent increasing 'punitive' military actions against Lebanon, Jordan and the UAR as closely connected with the Israeli militarists' attempts to undermine efforts for a settlement by peaceful means. It is a fact that the Israeli militarists bring down blows on military and civilian targets, particularly in those Arab states (UAR, Jordan and Lebanon)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which expressed their acceptance of the Security Council resolution of November 1967 and show readiness for a settlement to the present crisis by peaceful means.

Such adventurous actions, while sabotaging sane efforts for a peaceful settlement, pave the way for a new conflagration.

Thus, while possibilities for a peaceful settlement do exist and widen with the growing feeling of world public opinion that it is necessary to put out the focus of world war conflagration in our region, the continuation of the present occupation, coupled with the US-backed adventurous policy of the ruling circles of our country, increases the danger of a new war to the detriment of the people of Israel and the Arab countries, and of world peace.

More and more people in our country are becoming aware of the correct warning of the Communist Party of Israel concerning the dangers emanating from the pro-imperialist and expansionist policy of the ruling circles of Israel. More people are becoming conscious of the dangers involved in the continued Israeli occupation of Arab territories and of the necessity of accepting and implementing the UN Security Council resolution as the only way out.

P. Lavon, the ex-Security Minister, a previous Mapai leader and General Secretary of the Histadrut (purged by Ben-Gurion), called recently for a one-sided Israeli withdrawal from most of the occupied territories 'before it is too late'. In an interview with *Davar* (December 20, 1968), P. Lavon made a mockery of the official formula that a peace settlement should be achieved only by 'direct negotiations and a signed peace contract' and said:

> Now it is possible to say that this formula has become a curtain behind which all kinds of annexationists take cover and with the help of which they try to shut the mouths of everyone who does not accept their will.

Such voices as those of the religious Professor Leibovitz and Professor Arieli, both of the Hebrew University, warning against the continuation of the policy of occupation, are being heard more often.

Both professors addressed a students' gathering in Jerusalem, organised by the Students' Committee for Security Through Peace. Professor Leibovitz said:

> Every danger emanating from evacuating the occupied territories is not equal to the total destruction that will befall Israeli society as a result of holding on to one and a half million Arabs under the rule of occupation against their will. Logical development will turn us into a secret-police state. Its slogan will be 'the best people to the secret-police in the united Eretz Israel' (Land of Israel, i.e. Palestine). Such a state would become detached from the Jewish people and would have no Jewish content and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would in the best conditions become a state like Rhodesia . . . (*Al-Hamishmar*, December 23, 1968).

Professor Arieli added:

We shall become a state like Rhodesia but with the disadvantage that we shall not have the hinterland of South Africa which Rhodesia possesses . . . (*Al-Hamishmar*, December 23, 1968).

The growing international isolation of Israel as a result of the adventurist policy, the growing absence of security as a result of the deepening crisis, the increasing losses and sacrifices in men and resources, the heavier economic burden upon the masses, and the accumulating dangers in consequence of the continued policy of occupation, are increasing the voices of realism even within the governing parties.

It is not a secret in Israel that the latest military raid against the airport of Beirut was opposed by a number of ministers, and it was with Eshkol voting in favour of the action that it was carried out.

The Communist Party of Israel, having at heart the cause of peace, Israel's real national interests which lie in co-operation and understanding with the Arab countries, and the interests of all the peoples of our region, Arabs and Jews, is tirelessly mobilising all possible forces in the country in favour of a peaceful way out of the present impasse. Notwithstanding the repressive measures, chauvinist incitement and terror against its members, the Communist Party of Israel holds up the banner of peace between Israel and the Arab countries, and fights relentlessly to free Israel from the suicidal, pro-imperialist, aggressive policy of its rulers.

In the parliamentary debate that took place in the Knesset on December 31, 1968, following upon the raid on Beirut airport, Member of the Knesset Meir Vilner, Secretary of the Politbureau of the Communist Party of Israel, while condemning the attack on the Israeli El-Al plane in Athens airport, denounced the official Israeli policy as responsible for this continued bloodshed in the region and strongly condemned the Beirut raid. He stated:

The latest development in the international arena, in spite of all difficulties, creates in our opinion new possibilities for a political solution to the crisis, for the prevention of a new war, for the turning of a new page in Israeli-Arab relations. We have to integrate ourselves into this development, to contribute our share to a peace settlement, to the prevention of a new conflagration, thereby paving the way for a stable and permanent peace in our region. Much as you wish to wriggle out of it, there is no other solution but the implementation of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967. There is no positive alternative to this solution. And this resolution takes into account the just and lawful interests of Israel and the Arab peoples alike.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TELEVISION

Filleted Haldane

Ivor Montagu

DREISER, Robeson, Chaplin, Gorky, Brecht, Picasso, Anatole France, Shaw—these are all giants whose association in one way or another with the movement for human emancipation has led to establishment burial beneath a tombstone of praise from which all mention of what they stood for is carefully erased.

Malcolm Muggeridge, in the intervals between baring his soul or castigating the sins from which age exempts him, is always there to remind us that the Webbs' great tribute to 'Soviet Communism' was a mere act of dotage. The latest telly victim to get 'the treatment' is now J. B. S. Haldane ('The Last of the Polymaths', February 6, 1969, BBC 2). Months of study went into the preparation of this programme, 'a portrait of this remarkable but unusual scientist seen through the eyes of his friends and critics' (*Radio Times*, January 30, 1969).

The picture that emerged safely was just one more stereotype of the eccentric professor, his contact with Communism the equivalent of accidentally dining off the lab-dissected frog instead of the packet of sandwiches. Critics there were indeed: Darlington—to whom, ironically enough, J. B. S. Haldane was inflexibly loyal in his lifetime and against whom he would accept no word of criticism—was cut back to whenever a word of condescension or belittlement appeared appropriate. True friends, also, in the persons of Chain and Maynard Smith. What there was not was any friend or associate from the dozen or so vital years of Haldane's work with the *Daily Worker* and the Communist Party—the period of the growth of fascism, the betrayal of Spanish democracy, the run-up to the Second World War, the war itself. Haldane's chairmanship of the paper became a mere picturesque oddity, an aberration like his final resort to India and the wearing of the dhoti. Likewise there was plenty about his invaluable war work on the effects of breathing high concentrations of carbon dioxide. Not a word that these dangerous and painful experiments were undertaken using not only himself and Helen Sturway as guinea-pigs but also men of the International Brigade, several recovered by him for this voluntary task from the concentration camps abroad to which they had been exiled by the idiot British Government.

The truth is that J. B. S. Haldane was the most consistent whole man of his time, a humanist to whom no thought was alien or too daring, no discipline that attracted him too deep for exploration, and all meaningless unless contributory to action for the advancement of mankind.

It was no accident that he came to Marxism. He found in Engels a philosophy embodying his own approach to science and the relation between man and the rest of nature, and his interest in it was so persistent that, as R. Palme Dutt attests, he never missed a meeting of the *Modern Quarterly* Editorial Board. He came to the *Daily Worker* for a severely practical reason. He considered (thirty years before 'modernisation' became a catchword of Wilson) that the ordinary man needed to understand scientific thought and development, felt a call to expound it—which he did brilliantly—and the *Daily Herald* refused him even an occasional column. And he joined with Communists because he found thereby

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the means to struggle to secure adequate air-raid protection for the population against the perils from Hitler to which Tory betrayal was delivering it undefended. The retirement to India was equally principled. A personal attempt, by teaching and example, to contribute however minutely to redressing the balance of imperialist exploitation, and the dhoti itself an appropriate symbol of respect for the culture and civilisation that the colonisers in topee and trousers had neglected and despised.

It is not that the BBC did not know this. Their researches led them to me, and to R. Page Arnot, for example. But such information did not suit the safer picture of the latest in the long line of our island eccentrics. An intellectual may be revealed as a progressive if his sentiments remain in the domain of feeling. What must never be revealed is a logical connection between knowledge, conscience and action. One thing certain, however, is that if a polymath is one to whom nothing human is alien, and whom his science and courage drive to devote himself utterly to human welfare, then J. B. S. will *not* be the last.

THEATRE

Rich Seam
Roger Woddis

TOTAL THEATRE uses a variety of forms and techniques—song, movement, mime, satire, slides, etc.—to make its impact. When it is allied to a theme of universal proportions we have total theatre in a richer sense. The audience is totally involved, the fourth wall down and replaced by a community of understanding between performers and onlookers that goes back to drama's primitive roots.

'Close the Coalhouse Door' is a play about the miners of North East England—'born in love and indignation', says Sid Chaplin from whose short stories Alan Plater made his adaptation. It grew out of the real soil of the history it celebrates.

From the opening song ('Close the coalhouse door, there's blood inside') to the moving finale when the entire cast bows in humble acknowledgment to the union banners, we are caught up in a living story that is still being told. There is everything here—the bitter struggles, the horrifying details of child labour, the greed and hypocrisy of the owners, the defeats and the victories. And above all the humour, the indestructible affirmation of life.

The ensemble playing of a superb cast headed by Colin Douglas, Bryan Pringle and John Woodvine, Alex Glasgow's songs, Brian Currah's sets and lighting—all reflect the unifying purpose of director Bill Hays.

After its recent West End run this production is now on tour, taking in Glasgow, Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Newcastle and Billingham. Trade unionists should organise block bookings from their branches. They will echo the feelings of a Viennese visitor: 'I walked out holding my head high because I belong to the same race as the mining folk—the human race.'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

The Complete Bolivian Diaries of Che Guevara (and Other Captured Documents)

Edited and with an introduction by Daniel James

Allen & Unwin, 330 pp., 42s.

AS ONE OF THE FEW personal records of the day-to-day problems of guerrilla struggle, the diaries of Che Guevara during his ill-fated attempt to spark a revolution in Bolivia in 1966-67 (along with those of 3 of his companions also included here) will no doubt always be read henceforth by students of guerrilla warfare. In these simple notations are to be found the heroism, the comradeship and the great spirit that animate those who undertake this most difficult form of armed revolutionary struggle. It is a fascinating account.

The long introduction by Daniel James is the type of bone-picking dissertation expected from one who looks at Guevara from the standpoint of the CIA and the US Special Forces (the role of which James buries in the background). As James puts it, Bolivia's President Barrientos is a revolutionary, the Bolivian army is 'a people's army', and the US was only 'honouring its treaty obligations' with its assistance. After wading through this, it is all the more stirring to get to the simple truth and dedication of Che's own words.

One wishes that the diaries held a mention of what Che's guerrillas said to Bolivian peasants (who failed to give them support). Equally noticeable is the absence of any comment on Bolivian conditions or class relationships in the midst of which the guerrillas fought.

Unfortunately for those who have read Che's earlier books, who were instructed by his *Guerrilla Warfare* and inspired by his *Reminiscences of the Cuban Revolutionary War*, the diaries come as an anti-climax. They exude not only courage, but tragedy, error and faulty estimate. As far as strategy and tactics are concerned, the revolutionary student will learn here from bad example and not from good. It is not surprising that his enemies, who wish to discredit him and to confuse the cause for which he fought, have hurried to get these diaries into print, as well as his admirers, who wish to exalt him.

The Cuban edition has none of the editorial defects listed above, while on the other hand it has the advantage of an eloquent 14-page introduction by Fidel Castro himself.

WILLIAM J. POMEROY

Your Parliament

Charles D. Bateman

Pergamon Press, 168 pp., 25s. Hard cover, 15s. Flexi-cover.

THIS BOOK IS ADDRESSED to sixth formers. It is a brief account of parliamentary procedure and the history of party government and the Houses of Parliament.

A rosy picture is painted of what we receive in the way of benefits, educational and welfare, with no reference to the vast Government spending on armaments. In a chapter called 'Picking a Party' the author, after stating that: 'The multi-party system has its faults but the alternative is dictatorship, whether by a single party or by a single individual; and we all know what dangers lie along that path,' goes on in order to 'avoid the charge of being biased' to give extracts from the writings of the four main parties, starting with some

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

extracts from 'Forty Fighting Years,' by J. R. Campbell (published by the Communist Party).

I doubt if this book will be of much interest to sixth formers as too much space is given to some of our outdated parliamentary procedures and not enough to the real issues affecting them.

RUTH LONGONI

Children of Vietnam
H. C. Carlisle
British Medical Aid Committee
30 pp., 3s.

'Limited Bombing' in Vietnam
Peter and Gunilla Weiss
Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation,
40 pp., 5s.

WHO COULD SAY DEFINITELY how many hundred thousands of Vietnam's children have been sacrificed for the United States' ambitions in Vietnam? Officially, the US estimates 12,500 killed and 75,000 wounded every year in South Vietnam alone. They have not talked about the victims of their air raids on the North.

Children of Vietnam relates how this state of affairs came about, what are the horrors and injuries the US war machine inflicts on the children and what is being done for these victims. Shining through this booklet is the contrast between the indifference and inefficiency shown by the US-Saigon administration and the really heroic exertions of the medical services of the National Liberation Front and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

I use the word heroic advisedly, for these men and women have to work in conditions that could daunt less devoted people. It is to help overcome some of the difficulties met with in these rescue operations that the Medical Aid Committee for Vietnam asks for money, and no one looking at the photos in this book and reading the text could refuse their help.

A useful supplement to *Children of Vietnam* is the account by Peter and Gunilla Weiss of the first three months of Johnson's restricted bombing of North Vietnam last year. Based on documentary evidence from the responsible authorities collected by the authors during a visit to Vietnam, it conveys soberly and factually a picture of these attacks, that could have had no military significance whatsoever. And in the same sober and factual way we get an impressive picture of the counter-actions of the Vietnamese people in face of this merciless onslaught.

HILDA VERNON

Vicious Circle
Wilfred Wood & John Downing
SPCK, 88 pp., 6s.

THIS IS A SOBER and almost dispassionate analysis of the passion-arousing vicious circle of race relations in Great Britain to-day, written by two clergymen, one of whom is a West Indian.

The writers shirk no issue, and pull no punches, but they write carefully and write only of what they know; and they can distinguish between reality and propaganda. Their down-to-earth estimate of the reality is as true and penetrating as it is horrifying. I trust they will forgive me for saying that they write like good Marxists.

When they deal with what is to be done by way of remedy for the evils of racism, they naturally address themselves to the Church and its organisations; but what they urge them to do is what everyone should be told to do, and should do.

D. N. PRITT

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A MATTER OF PRIORITY

THE flow of letters from trade unionists and shop stewards in protest against Barbara Castle's White Paper show how strong is the feeling on this vital issue. Our journal, in common with all on the Left, is fulfilling its primary task in these crucial days by continuing to regard the fight for trade union freedom as a matter of the first priority.

Ernie Roberts, Assistant General Secretary of the AEF and contributor in our February issue, writes: 'Thank you for this campaign on behalf of the trade unions.' And from a Nottingham bus driver: 'We can't let the Government get away with this. *LM* is doing a fine job in explaining what the workers stand to lose—and how we can win.' Those in the front line of the battle are finding *LM* a valuable weapon against the enemies of trade unionism.

On a personal note: it is an inspiring experience to become *LM*'s Managing Editor at a time of growing struggle. One realises immediately how close are the ties between our journal and its readers. A reader from Reading, for example, passes his copy round and gets this result: 'One of my workmates asked me to give him your address so that he can take out a subscription. I'm sure that's good news for you.' And it certainly is.

Nicola Seyd

£111 13s. 11d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: T. Crichton, £3; 'Oliver Twist', 10s; M. Morgan, 5s; M. Philibert, 5s; H. L. (USA), £10; Kitty Kokos and friends (+ extra), 17s 6d; W. E. Rounce, 5s; J. Rink, 5s; D. Belenson, £1; E. Strachan Rogers (+ New Year Gift), £2 2s; L. Hadfield, 10s; G. I., 1s 8d; 'S. Mill', £1; K. Rintoul, 10s; 'Pax', 6s; L. Bates, 5s; Oldham Branch, 2s; Blackburn Branch, 3s; H. Brindle, 5s; Stella and Len Perkins, 5s; John and Jenny Pinkerton (+ extra), 10s; J. D. (Canada), 15s 6d; D. H. Strathern, 10s; J. Roose-Williams, £1; E. Sheldon, £1; A Corbett, £1; R. F. B., £3; L'Humanité, 5s; R. Paul, 10s; Southend Branch, £1; 'Socialist Sailor', £2; E. J. B., 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A. M. T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s.

OTHER DONATIONS include: R. A. Ward, 4s 6d; H. Cohen, £1 4s 6d; L. Bond, 4s 6d; W. Charles, £1; N. L. Wilkinson, £2; B. D. Youatt, £3; C. Thornhill, 10s; W. L. Dutton, 10s; S. Hoyland, £5; Ronald Gray, £1; Kay Ekevall (in memory of my husband), £1; J. H. Wood, 12s; R. McCrea, £1; L. Green, 3s; Mr. and Mrs. P. Feltham, £1; A. S. Walker, £2 2s 6d; T. L. and W. Drinkwater, 10s; H. Rosen, 10s; J. J. Christie, 5s; W. Rees, 10s; Mrs. R. Burree, £1; H. F. List, 7s 6d; B. Foster, 10s; C. Wrench, 3s; A. R. Hodgkinson, 10s; G. Callicott, £8; D. McCallum, £1; H. Hawkins, 10s; D. A. Hamilton, £1; W. Rickeard, £1 4s; J. Laird, 3s; J. D. Munro, 5s; Mrs. B. G. Ireland, 5s; P. L. Wyvill, 4s 6d; J. Lipetz, £2 4s 6d; J. Redfern, 5s; J. S. D. Bacon, £1; 'Anon', £2; 'Tom Paine', £16 16s 6d; J. W. R. Clark, £3; J. A. Fraser, £1 10s; G. Dowling, £4; H. Thomas, 10s; B. S. Marsh, 5s; J. J. Prewett, £1; D. I. P. Rees, £1; Bob and Jean Goodall, £1; V. W. Say, 10s; P. Levy, 10s; H. Corbishley, 4s 6d; Dr. and Mrs. Walker, 10s; J. G. A., 10s; F. L. (Notts.), 10s; Finchley C. N. D., 5s; B and K. R. (USA), £2 9s 3d.

Our thanks to you all,
Co-op No. L99482

134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
01-346 5135

Published by Unity Publications (Finchley), Ltd., and printed by London Caledonian Press Ltd. (T.U.), Watford, Herts.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POST FREE SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Home and Overseas	1 year	£2 0 0
(Unsealed envelope)	6 months	£1 0 0
USA	1 year	$6.00
	(sealed	$9.00)
	6 months	$3.00
Canada	1 year	$6.50
	(sealed	$7.50)
	6 months	$3.25

Air Mail rates quoted on application

Please start my subscription from the

..... issue

Name.....

Address .....

Special Students' Concession

1 year	£1 15 0
6 months	17 6

I am a bona fide student at

.....

Please start my subscription from the

..... issue

Name.....

Address .....

.....

.....

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

13 *Days—The Cuban Missile Crisis*, Robert F. Kennedy. Pan Books, 190 pp., 5s.

The English Utopia, A. L. Morton. Lawrence & Wishart, 296 pp., 12s 6d.

Critics of Empire, Bernard Porter. Macmillan, 370 pp., 70s.

Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Lawrence & Wishart, 800 pp., 63s.

The People's Republic, Obafemi Awolowo. Oxford University Press, 356 pp., 90s.

The History of The German Labour Movement, Helga Grebing. Wolff, 228pp., 50s.

Consumers in Politics, Thomas F. Carbery. Manchester University Press, 276 pp., 50s.

Philosophy of World Revolution, Franz Marek. Lawrence & Wishart, 138 pp., 21s.

Aspects of the Biafran Affair, George Knapp. Britain-Biafra Association, 56 pp., 2s. 6d.

Public Education in the USSR, Mikhail Prokofyev. Novosti Press, 52 pp., 1s. 6d.

Women in the USSR, Nadezda Tatarinova. Novosti Press, 110 pp., 1s. 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PAMPHLETS

Still a few copies available of:

U.S. CHEMICAL WARFARE
by Prof. E. H. S. Burhop 6d

INDIA IN TRAVAIL
by R. Palme Dutt 1s 0d

WHITHER CHINA?
by R. Palme Dutt 2s 6d

Order from:

134 Ballards Lane, London N.3 or
CENTRAL BOOKS
37 Gray's Inn Road, W.C.1

For all interested in the fight for Peace and Progress in the Countryside and the problems of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.

Annual Subscription 3/- post free or send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD
27 Bedford St., Strand, London, W.C.2

MIMETTE FURS LTD.

Wide range of furs, coats, stoles and capes.

117 High Street, Croydon, Surrey
'Phone CROydon 4328

ORDER NOW!

Labour Monthly Bound Volume for 1968

Price £1 15s. 0d., post free, or send 15s. 6d. and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

LABOUR MONTHLY
134 BALLARDS LANE
LONDON, N.3

LABOUR RESEARCH

HOW MUCH DOCK NATIONALISATION?

Q. AND A. ON THE NEW PENSIONS

THE HOUSING BILL

1s. 6d., or 1s. 10d. by post

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
78 Blackfriars Road, London, S.E.1

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(4s. a line, minimum 12s. Cash with order to: 'Class. Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

SOCIALIST LIBRARIES & pamphlets bought. 01-876 7254. Hammersmith Books, Liffords Pl., S.W.13.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED